



Docket No. 14961

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
VERIFICATION OF A TRANSLATION

I, Susan ANTHONY BA, ACIS,

Director of RWS Group plc, of Europa House, Marsham Way, Gerrards Cross,
Buckinghamshire, England hereby declare that:

My name and post office address are as stated below;

That the translator responsible for the attached translation is knowledgeable in the English language and in the Japanese language, and that, to the best of RWS Group plc knowledge and belief, the English translation of the marked portion of the attached Japanese document is true and complete.

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Date: May 5, 2004

Signature :

For and on behalf of RWS Group plc

Post Office Address :

Europa House, Marsham Way,
Gerrards Cross, Buckinghamshire,
England.



NOTES

Although paragraph [0019] of the "Detailed Description of the Invention" describes a "compression type judgment means 14 that compares the predicted error of a vector position obtained by a vector search means 13 with the average deviation within a frame and selects a compression type of good compression efficiency", and paragraph [0027] describes a "compression type judgment means 14 that compares the minimum predicted error with the average deviation within a frame to determine the compression type of the macroblocks", what compression type is selected and at what time it is selected using the compared result of the predicted error and average deviation is totally unclear.

(If the point noted above is one that was regarded as common knowledge at the time of the submission of the application please cite an example of its use and please provide an explanation of this in any letter of refutation that is submitted).

Accordingly, the description given in the "Detailed Description of the Invention" is neither sufficiently thorough nor clear enough for a person skilled in the art to be able to implement the inventions pertaining to Claims 1 to 10.

2. In the following points, the description given in the "Scope of the Patent Claims" does not satisfy the requirements set forth in Article 36, Paragraph 6, Item Nos. 1 and 2 of the Patent Act.

NOTES

It is unclear what is represented by the inner means in the device [missing text], and the relationship between each of the means is unclear. Please provide clarification of, by way of example, the following ambiguous points.

(i) Although Claim 1 describes a "vector search means for detecting motion vectors in macroblock units across an input original picture to obtain a predicted macroblock of the best compression efficiency", exactly what "a predicted macroblock of the best compression efficiency" refers to is unclear, and the technological relationship that exists between the detection of a motion vector and the obtaining of a predicted macroblock of the best compression efficiency is also unclear. Accordingly, exactly what the above-noted "vector search means" represents is unclear.

(ii) Although Claim 1 describes "a compression type judgment means for adjudging whether the obtained macroblock has been encoded within a frame or encoded over a frame", as is specified in (i) above, exactly what

the "obtained macroblock" represents is unclear, and it is also unclear whether said "obtained macroblock" is encoded or not. In addition, by virtue of the fact that it is unclear how and with what means the adjudged effect adjudged using the above-noted compression type judgment means is employed, the technological import of the judgment of compression type is unclear.

(iii) Although Claim 1 describes "compression in a frame performed only when there is no change in the encoding efficiency even if, without detection of the optimum predicted vector using the compression type judgment means, the frames as a whole have been compression fixed in a frame", by virtue of the fact that no description is given of the detection of the optimum predicted vector using the "compression type judgment means", the exact conditions that exist for what is described as "without detection of the optimum predicted vector using the compression type judgment means" is unclear.

In addition, exactly what conditions are being referred to in the description "when there is no change in the encoding efficiency even if the frames as a whole have been compression fixed in a frame" is unclear.

Moreover, the matters specified for the above-noted (i) to (iii) also apply to Claim 6.

(2) Although Claim 4 describes an "animated image high-speed encoding device according to Claim 1 to Claim 3", an ambiguity exists in said description as to whether all of Claims 1 to 3 have been cited or one of the claims thereof has been cited.

(3) Although Claim 7 describes an "animated image high-speed encoding method according to Claim 5", the description given in Claim 5 is of an "animated image high-speed encoding device".

(4) Although Claims 5 and 10 describe "the obtaining of the abovementioned vector only when the order for compression of the key frame that displays the abovementioned inter-frame encoding has been established", no description is provided in the "Detailed Description of the Invention" of the "obtaining of a predicted vector" when the "key frame that displays the inter-frame encoding" is compressed.

In addition, by virtue of the fact that motion vectors are not normally employed when frame encoding is performed, [missing text].

Accordingly, the inventions pertaining to Claims 1, 4 to 6, 7 and 10 are unclear.

In addition, no description is provided in the "Detailed Description of the Invention" of the inventions pertaining to Claims 5 and 10.

3. The inventions pertaining to the claims of the application noted below cannot be granted patent rights in accordance with the provisions of Patent Act, Article 29, Paragraph 2 because, based on the inventions disclosed in the publications noted below which have been circulated within and outside Japan prior to the submission of the application or which are inventions that are able to be publicly utilized using an electronic communication line, they could have been easily invented prior to the submission of the application by a person having knowledge common to the field of technology to which the inventions belong.

NOTES (Regarding cited documents etc., see the Reference
List of Cited Documents etc.)

Claims: 1 and 6

Cited documents: 1 and 2

Remarks:

Paragraphs [0012] to [0015] of Cited Document 1 describe compression by encoding in a frame when the encoding in a frame and adjudged macroblock number is greater than a threshold value.

In addition, the obtaining of motion vectors in macroblock units within an original picture image constitutes, as described in, for example, lines 2 to 13 lower right-hand column of page 3 of cited document 2, a common technique.

List of Cited Documents etc.

1. Japanese Unexamined Patent Application No. Heisei 6-54315
2. Japanese Unexamined Patent Application No. Heisei 3-220887